

	A	B
1	Chapter	Page
2	3.0	1
3	3.0	43
4	3.0	73
5	3.0	80
6	3.0	84
7	3.0	85
8	3	52-57
9	3	54
10	3	54
11	3.0	Figure 3-18
12	4.10	38
13	4.10	46
14	4.10	47
15	4.10	48
16	4.10	48
17	4.10	50
18	4.10	66
19	4.10	66

	C
1	<b>Text</b>
2	The Maritime Reservation Scenario and variants are not incompatible with one another. Any one of them, or any two, or all three, could be developed in
3	Events and Attendance
4	MRS
5	Peaker Plant Variant
6	Public Agency Approvals Required
7	Table 3-6
8	Discussion of transportation improvements
9	"The TDM program for the ballpark..."
10	"The TDM program for the ballpark would include a wide variety of elements for implementation by the Project sponsor in coordination with OakDOT. A partial list is included here and more detail can
11	MRS Buildout
12	2B (Inner Harbor Turning Basin <del>Line of Sight</del> at an elevation of 64 feet above water),
13	"This chapter evaluates only those fundamental conflicts that could result in a direct or indirect physical impact on the environment. Seaport Compatibility Measures may incorporate results of this analysis (i.e. the mitigation measures presented below), and may also include measures, designs, and operational standards to also be identified that address non-CEQA conflicts."
14	"For example, an increased delay of a few minutes getting from I-880 into the Port and a few minutes returning to I-880 may be sufficient to prevent a truck driver from completing a trip within the legally allowed driving time. The impact on Port efficiency could result in loss of business and imperil Port functioning."
15	4.10-48:  "The non-ballpark development would be required to develop a Transportation and Parking Demand Management (TDM) Plan to reduce vehicle traffic generated by the Project to the maximum extent practicable. The performance venue would also be required to establish a TDM Plan that incorporates traffic management strategies to minimize its traffic impact on neighboring communities, including the seaport, that may include traffic and/or parking control offices or other personnel acceptable to the City to manage traffic at key intersections and railroad crossings. The TDM Plans for the Project would be required as Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a.
16	-
17	-
18	"...noting that receptor sites 2B and 2C are not anticipated to have a direct view of the sports lighting fixtures under the <del>Reduced Height Ballpark</del> Project Option."
19	and well above both the estimated existing luminaire intensity (1,839 – 4,235 cd) and anticipated maximum luminaire intensity from the sports lighting fixtures (2,700-4,281 cd).

	D
1	<b>Comment</b>
2	This statement does not makes sense for the Maritime Reservation Scenario, which cannot be developed in conjunction with the Project.
3	a) Language to be modified as follows: "The ballpark could also be used for up to nine concerts with up to a maximum of <del>28,000</del> 35,000 attendees, per event, including attendees on the ballpark field, with concerts occurring during the night until 11:00 pm. Smaller events could occur at the ballpark and the Performance Center throughout the entire year."
	<i>The following language in the Maritime Reservation Area section should be updated as follows:</i>
4	"This would only occur if the Port <u>exercises</u> or terminates its recapture option prior to the expiration of the 10 year term."
	<i>Incorporate following changes:</i>
5	"The Peaker Power Plant Variant involves the planned <del>conversion-removal of the jet fuel components</del> of the existing Peaker Power Plant) and physical changes to the buildings, as described below.[1] <del>The conversion of the Peaker Power Plant elimination of the use of jet fuel can occur</del> because a battery storage system (referred to throughout as "battery storage") would be See Edits as Follows:
6	In so doing, it is anticipated that the City will apply all relevant requirements, ordinances, policies, and codes typically employed in its ordinary course of business, <u>subject to amendments and modifications negotiated as part of the site specific zoning and development agreement,</u> including but not limited to the City's requirements for stormwater
	<i>Under City of Oakland column, add:</i>
7	"Approve amendments to the City's Noise Ordinance".
8	This section seems to suggest all the identified improvements will be implemented as part of the project. Please clarify what is required v. what are options to meet standard.
9	TMP instead of TDM?
10	This suggests all the listed items will be implemented as part of the project. Clarify that these are options (assuming that is correct). See next comment.
11	the building heights are not correct and do not match the Project. Update.
12	make text edits shown to left
	This chapter addresses all "fundamental conflicts" (meaning whether the uses could continue), even though there is not an environmental impact. This is already broader than CEQA requires.
	Suggest revising to state:
13	<del>This chapter evaluates only those fundamental conflicts that could result in a direct or indirect physical impact on the environment.</del> Seaport Compatibility Measures may incorporate results of this analysis (i.e. the mitigation measures presented below), and may also include measures, designs, and operational standards to also be identified that address <u>potential</u> non-CEQA conflicts. Suggest deleting. I believe the transportation section acknowledges that there could be minor delays. This text suggests even a minor delay would be a significant impact.
14	Discuss
15	Ballpark is TMP; non-ballpark is TDM.  Not clear what "performance venue" is referring to.  Also, "maximum extent practicable" is not the standard. That text should be deleted.
	Make the following edits:
16	The non-ballpark development would be required to develop a Transportation and Parking Demand Management (TDM) Plan to reduce vehicle traffic generated by the Project <del>to the maximum extent.</del> See Edits:
17	Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measures TRANS-1a, TRANS-1b, TRANS-3a, and TRANS-3b, the Project would not result in a fundamental conflict with <u>Port road operations and rail access maritime navigation or water-based uses</u> , and impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated
18	make text edits shown to left
19	make text edits shown to left

	E
1	Commenter
2	GD
3	GD
4	GD
5	GD
6	GD
7	GD
8	RMM
9	RMM
10	RMM
11	GD
12	HLB
13	RMM
14	RMM
15	GD
16	GD
17	HLB
18	HLB
19	HLB

	A	B
20	4.10	94
	4.10	MM LUP-1a
21		
	4.10	MM LUP-1a
22		
	4.10	MM LUP-1a
23		
24	4.15	23
25	4.15	152
26	4.15	153
	4.15	194
27		
28	4.15	4.15-138
	4.15	4.15-140
29		
	4.15	4.15-145
30		
	4.15	4.15-184
31		
	4.15	4.15-197
32		
	4.15	General
33		
	4.15	MM TRANS-1a
34		
35	5.0	1
36	5.0	1
	5.0	6
37		

	C
20	<i>Mitigation Measure LUP-1a would require that during the interim 10-year period, small non-Port vessels would be prohibited from docking outside of the</i>
21	The protocol shall specify measures intended to minimize conflicts with maritime navigation resulting in safety hazards and ship delay, and shall be implemented prior to and during baseball games and large events at the new ballpark. The protocol shall include, but shall not be limited to, the followin requirements
22	ii. Installation and maintenance of signs along the wharf informing small commercial vessels that they would be prohibited from docking outside of the area included in the MRS
23	iii. funding by the Oakland A's for additional waterwWater-based patrols by the Oakland Police Department, baseball games and large events and to ensure compliance with the rules of navigation in the shipping channel prior to and during games or and large events; and
24	et seq (all the Grids for the Off Site Transportation Features)
25	-
26	-
27	MM TRANS-1b
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	Table 4.15-37  Row 13, coulumn 3:
35	"Yes, residential and commercial developments exceeding the stated parking ratios would be designed with retrofittable garages"
36	These potential project features are identified as variants because they are elements of the project that are sufficiently complex that they warrant their own, separate analysis
37	The variants are not "alternatives" within the meaning of CEQA, however, in that they address specific elements of the project, and are not alternatives to the project as a whole
	In order to address the system reliability issues currently addressed by the Peaker Power Plant, as well as other clean energy initiatives, Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) and CAISO developed the Oakland Clean Energy Initiative (OCEI). The OCEI is a plan that, when completed, would allow (but not require) the RMR agreement to be terminated. A Vistra Energy battery storage project with East Bay Community Energy (EBCE) is one of several battery storage projects and energy initiatives that are proposed for the OCEI. However, Vistra intends to operate the Vistra-EBCE battery storage project in parallel with the Peaker Power Plant. Hence, both the Vistra EBCE battery storage project and the Peaker Power Plant are expected to operate simultaneously, while the RMR agreement

	D
20	This statement is not true because it is not included in the Mit measure. Please update accordingly
	"large events" as defined in TMP
	Revise:
21	The protocol shall specify measures intended to minimize conflicts with maritime navigation resulting in safety hazards and ship delay, and shall be implemented prior to and during baseball games and concerts at the new ballpark, and large events as defined in the TMP scheduled at the Waterfront Park. The protocol shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following requirements to be funded by
	Port vessels can only dock small vessels in the MRA during for up to 10 years during the interim period, this reads as if port vessels can always dock there which is not the case. Text needs to be revised to be factually correct
22	
	"Large events" as described in TMP
	Revise:
23	iii. funding by the Oakland A's for additional Water-based patrols by the Oakland Police Department, during and reasonably prior and subsequent to, all baseball games, concerts, and large events as defined in the TMP at the Waterfront Park, which cost shall be borne by the Project sponsor to remove any boating and water recreation activity not in compliance with the rules of navigation in the
24	Please update footer at bottom to clarify that the improvements are subject to review, and approval by City of Oakland <i>"and other responsible agencies."</i>
25	Add <i>"Implementation of these improvements will be subject to the approval of Caltrans."</i>
26	Add <i>"Implementation of these improvements will be subject to the approval of the CPUC."</i>
	Incorporate comments from TMP discussion to make requirements consistent, including "expected to be implemented by opening day" language.
27	TDR Implementation – Please make following edit: <i>"TMP Implementation – For VTR strategies involving physical improvements, the Project applicant shall obtain the necessary permits/approvals from the City and install the improvements prior to the completion of the ballpark, to the extent feasible."</i>
28	Refers to "station agents" at BART stations. Revise to match up with final version of TMP.
29	Lists "City priorities" with respect to TMP. Note reference to "free" shuttle service. Shuttle service may or may not be free; essential component is boarding efficiently. Revise to match up with final version of TMP.
	Table 4.15-21 – item 13 – refers to garages that can be retrofitted. Revise language to conform to final version of
30	Mitigation Measure TRANS-1a: applies the 20% VTR reduction requirement to each building. MM should allow for aggregating buildings or phases, provided the City has sufficient assurance that the 20% target is being met. If one building or phase exceeds 20% VTR target, then another building or phase should be able to get "credit" for exceedance. There should be flexibility in how buildings or
31	The TDM Plan shall comply with the requirements of the AB 734 legislation (Section 21168.6.7(a)(3)(A)(iii)) which states that the Project must have a TDM Plan that achieves a 20% reduction in vehicle trips as compared to operations absent the plan. At this time a separate TDM Plan shall be prepared for each building in the non-ballpark development. <i>The Project sponsor may propose a TDM plan that encompasses more than one building, provided the buildings include in the plan are encompassed in a particular phase, and provided that the TDM plan demonstrates, to the City's satisfaction, that the TDM plan will achieve the 20% reduction in the aggregate for the buildings encompassed in that plan.</i> The TDM plan for each building shall achieve the 20% reduction within
32	Page lists "City priorities" for TMP. Bullets include restricting TNCs to "off-street lots." Revise to "identified facilities," as TNCs may be directed to facilities other than off-street lots. Note that, in any event, (1) locations will be less desirable than those available to transit, and (2) TNCs will be managed so that they must use those facilities.
33	Tables are sometimes not numbered consecutively, and certain table numbers are skipped. Double-check table numbering and citations to tables in text. Generally, F&P needs to cross-check chapter against final versions of TMP and TDM. Some inconsistencies noted below, but F&P should double-check once TMP and TDM are finalized.
	All spaces or just those in excess of the stated ratio?
34	
35	Discuss
36	This seems unnecessary and not really accurate – an alternative can address an element, and not the project as a whole. They are not alternatives because they are not designed to lessen significant
	Add text in red shown in cell to the right
37	

	E
20	GD
	NR
21	
	NR
22	
	NR
23	
24	GD
25	GD
26	GD
	GD
27	
28	RMM
	RMM
29	
	RMM
30	
	RMM
31	
32	RMM
	RMM
33	
	NR
34	
35	Paul Hastings
36	Paul Hastings
	GD
37	



	A	B
38	5.0	6
39	5.0	12
40	5.0	12
41	5.0	14
42	5.0	17
43	5.0	21
44	5.0	21
45	5.0	22
46	5.0	23
47	5.0	28
48	5.0	28
49	5.0	29
50	5.0	29
51	5.0	29
52	5.0	30
53	5.0	35
54	5.0	43
55	5.0	44
56	5.0	46
57	5.0	55
58	5.0	60
59	5.0	89
60	5.0	90

	C
38	"However, Vistra intends to serve the Vistra-EBCE battery storage..."
39	Project in Phase 1 or prior to Buildout
40	. The impact analysis conservatively assumes that this variant will be constructed and commence operations in Phase 1 because that is the scenario in which the variant's impacts will be greatest, particularly with respect to air pollutant emissions during construction
41	In other words, the new development accommodated on the fuel tank site would be accommodated by a redistribution result in an increase in the total square footage of uses proposed as part of the Project
42	In other words, the new development accommodated on the fuel tank site would be accommodated by a redistribution result in an increase in the total square footage of uses proposed as part of the Project
43	"construction emissions were estimated for activities associated with building renovation and conversion from jet fuel turbines to battery storage."
44	Table 5-1 presents average... with maximum daily emissions of 74.8 lbs/day. This exceedance is slightly greater than the project...
45	Table 5-1
46	"similar to the project, partial buildout operational emissions of ROG and NOX would exceed..."
47	Table 5-4
48	Because operational generator TACs for the Peaker Power Plant variant would be greater than the Project due to the additional emergency generator associated with the Variant's operation, and because operational generator TACs drive health risks at the new onsite MEIR (relative to construction), unmitigated cancer risk and annual average PM2.5 concentrations would exceed the health risk thresholds, similar to the Project.
49	Table 5-5 shows the mitigated HRA results for new onsite receptors for Scenario 2 exposure from construction
50	Same as the Project, Mitigation Measure AIR-5a was assumed to reduce cancer risk, chronic HI, and PM2.5 concentrations by approximately 76 percent
51	table 5-5
52	These health risk values are slightly greater than the Project due to increased operational TAC emissions from the new emergency generator. Please refer to section 4.2 Air Quality, Table 4.2-15 for estimated health risks associated with TACs from the Project at the existing offsite MEIR. Overall, this impact would be greater than the Project but would remain less than significant with mitigation,
53	These exceedances are slightly less than the Project; this is because the MEIR for the Peaker Power Plant is at a different location from the MEIR for the Project (the Peaker Power Plant MEIR is located at Block 18 and the Project MEIR is located at Block 6), and the background health risk values are lower at the Peaker Power Plant MEIR than the Project MEIR
54	Table 5-10
55	45,068 MWh per year of electricity during peak use periods, which would result in an annual reduction in jet fuel consumption of 868,528 gallons
56	GHG emissions impact + table 5-11
57	"although except that removal of the jet storage tank..."
58	Peaker Plant Land Use
59	Table 5-12 presents... 78.8 lbs/day
60	Table 5-12

	D
38	I would distinguish between project and contract here because I don't believe EBCE is an owner. It is Vistra that is doing the operations, etc.
39	Phase 1 is prior to buildout. Should this say "Phase 1 or prior to the buildout of Phase 1"?
40	Consider removing the word "conservative"  Because the maximum year of construction emissions is 2021, it is conservative for construction CAPs to have construction for the variant occurring simultaneously (i.e., it adds to the worst year). Overall though, this may not be conservative operationally speaking, because:  · The earlier the PPP variant is constructed, the earlier we get large reductions in CAPs and GHGs due to powerplant shutdown.
41	it should say would <b>NOT</b> result in an increase in total square footage
42	Needs an edit.  Revise to say:  In other words, the new development on the fuel tank site would be accommodated by a redistribution of uses included in the proposed Project and would not result in an increase in the total square footage of proposed uses.
43	Revise: the power plant building renovation and conversion from jet fuel turbines to battery storage, as well as construction of the new mixed use building on the tank site
44	change 74.8 to 80.5.
45	Exceedance - This exceedance is equal to the Project. This exceedance occurs in 2021 and PPP construction doesn't begin until 2022. Therefore, construction emissions in 2021 are from the Project
46	Numerical edits
47	PM10 exceeds in 2027 too (see paragraph below as well)
48	numerical edits
49	Consider adding language to indicate that this HRA does not account for reduced TACs from jet fuel closure right?
50	Same comment as above re: scenarios
51	Discuss
52	numerical edits
53	Consider adding language here suggesting that this does not capture reduced risk associated with closure of the existing jet fuel power plant, so slight increase may be lower than shown or there could even be a reduction.
54	Yes but it is only the on-site cancer MEIR and not the on-site PM MEIR
55	numerical edits
56	Previously stated 7,953 MWh. This is equal to the battery electricity loss. Updated to 45,068 MWh, which is equal to the battery electricity supplied.
57	numerical edits
58	add "fuel" after "jet"
59	States that Peaker Power Plant property is subject to public trust. This is not true. Please strike language re SLC and public trust approval
60	change to 91.2
	numerical edits

	E
38	Dean Tibbs
39	Ramboll
40	Ramboll
41	Ramboll
42	RMM
43	Ramboll
44	Ramboll
45	Ramboll
46	Ramboll
47	Ramboll
48	Ramboll
49	Ramboll
50	Ramboll
51	Ramboll
52	Ramboll
53	Ramboll
54	Ramboll
55	Ramboll
56	Ramboll
57	Paul Hastings
58	GD
59	Ramboll
60	Ramboll

	A	B
	5.0	91
61		
62	5.0	91
	5.0	91
63		
64	5.0	97
65	5.0	115
66	5.0	117
67	5.0	143
	5.0	8-Jul
68		
69	5.0	112/113
70	5.0	24/25
71	5.0	31-34
72	5.0	36/37
73	5.0	92-94
74	5.0	99-104
	6.0	4
75		
76	6.0	13
	6.0	17
77		
78	6.0	17
	6.0	20
79		
80	6.0	20
81	6.0	27
	6.0	29
82		

	C
61	Based on the above assumptions, during full buildout operations, the Aerial Gondola Variant would result in unmitigated reductions in ROG of 6.4 pounds per day and 1.2 tons per year, reductions in NOX of 17.2 pounds per day and 3.1 tons per year, reductions in PM10 of 15.5 pounds per day and 2.8 tons per year, and reductions in PM2.5 of 3.5 pounds per day and 0.6 tons per year when compared to Project full buildout operations in 2027. This represents a 3 percent reduction in ROG, an 8 percent reduction in NOX, an 11 percent reduction in PM10, and a 10 percent reduction in
62	Table 5-13 summarizes total net new annual and average daily unmitigated emissions by year from 2023 through 2028 under the Aerial Gondola Variant, and compares Variant emissions with the City
63	although emissions would still exceed the significance thresholds in 2024-2028 similar to the Project. Similar to the Project, emissions of <b>NOx for the Variant would exceed the significance thresholds in all years from 2024 through 2028</b> , ROG for the Variant would exceed the significance thresholds in all years from 2025 through 2028, emissions of PM10 would exceed the significance thresholds in 2028, and emissions of PM2.5 would not exceed the significance thresholds in any year. These exceedances are less than the Project due to the reduction in operational mobile source emissions.
64	These health risk values are slightly greater than the Project due to increased operational TAC emissions from emergency generators
65	see doc - multiple slight numerical changes throughout page
66	Table 5-23
67	Operational noise from the gondola would also be generated when the gondola passes over towers and at the stations points, associated with the gondola cabin grip passing over cable
68	The Peaker Power Plant Variant involves the planned removal of the jet fuel components of the existing Peaker Power Plant) and physical changes to the buildings, as described below. The and the elimination of the use of jet fuel can occur because a battery storage system (referred to throughout as "battery storage") would be implemented by its owner, Vistra Energy, with participation by the Project sponsor. Vistra Energy has indicated that the estimated increase in power demand to serve the proposed Project would make the planned conversion economically feasible. The conversion is considered a variant in this EIR because Vistra Energy, as the land owner, has the authority to decide when, and if, the Peaker Power Plant would shut down, or continue to operate, after the RMR agreement has been terminated, and a contract is under negotiation between the Oakland A's and Vistra to require the shut down and decommissioning of the Peaker Power Plant. If the transaction with the A's is consummated, as part of this Variant the A's will require the closure of the Peaker Plant as a jet-fueled facility, the removal of the jet fuel tank and the modification of the Peaker Power Plant building exterior, as described more fully below.
69	The Project sponsor is seeking to acquire the Peaker Power Plant and if it does so, the variant will include exterior modifications to the building. In addition, interior modifications will occur whereby battery storage facilities will be installed on the interior of the power plant building. The installation of the batteries within the interior of the building will not be visible from the exterior of the building.
70	Tables 5-21 & 5-22
71	Table 5-2 + 5-3
72	Table 5-6 & 5-7
73	Table 5-8 + 5-9
74	Tables 5-13 & 5-14
75	Tables 5-17 - 5-20
76	Impact AIR-1:
77	... PM2.5 or 82 pounds per day of PM10
78	Table 6-1
79	Based on the emissions... 52,956 MT CO2e
80	Reference to "No Project Alternative"
81	6-20 [Table 6-1]:
82	COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVE 2: OFF-SITE (COLISEUM AREA) ALTERNATIVE WITH THE PROPOSED PROJECT
	Table 6-2
	56,000 to 59,000 cubic yards of soil
	"with the maximum cancer impact is immediately east of Brush Street on the north side of the railroad tracks and Alternative 3 would result in mitigated cancer risks of approximately 36 per million with an undercrossing on the Brush Street alignment, which is the closest grade separation alignment to an.."

	D
61	Added "unmitigated". see other minor numerical edits
62	Why does this table just show operational but the mitigated table below shows combined operational + construction?
63	Exceeds for NOx as well – see text edit (bold)
64	Should there also be another note here like "while risks from the reduction of mobile trips due to the use of the Gondola were not explicitly calculated, they would reduce risks somewhat below what
65	numerical edits
66	numerical edits
67	This paragraph is duplicated. Revise above paragraph if it remains.
68	Add red text shown in cell to the left
69	numerical edits
70	numerical edits
71	numerical edits
72	numerical edits
73	numerical edits
74	numerical edits
75	Just a note that PM10 and PM2.5 emissions do not exceed thresholds (54 and 82 lb/day, respectively) for the unmitigated nor mitigated scenario, but probably okay since it says "or"
76	Ramboll did not confirm these values
77	Ramboll did not confirm this value. Mitigated Project net new emissions are 53,026 MT CO2e. If Offsite alternative GHGs should match the project, please update.
78	twice within PP
79	should be changed to the "Off Site Alternative"
80	The table is comparing the off-site alternative to Alternative 2C in the CASP EIR, not the proposed project.
81	Substantial numerical changes
82	AQ analysis relies on 60-66,000 CY, which is conservative, so we decided this shouldn't be an issue.
	See edits here. The MEI is a slightly different receptor for the Project than for the Project + Grade Separation Alt.
82	Inserted :with the maximum cancer impact

	E
61	Ramboll
62	Ramboll
63	Ramboll
64	Ramboll
65	Ramboll
66	Ramboll
67	SCJ
68	GD
69	Ramboll
70	Ramboll
71	Ramboll
72	Ramboll
73	Ramboll
74	Ramboll
75	Ramboll
76	Ramboll
77	Ramboll
78	GD
79	RMM
80	Ramboll
81	Ramboll
82	Ramboll



	A	B
83	6.0	29
84	6.0	36
85	6.0	37
86	6.0	40
87	6.0	41
88	6.0	46
89	6.0	48
90	6.0	54
91	6.0	16-17
92	6.0	31/32

	C
83	"... option at Bush Street and 6 per million with the market street alignment..."
84	"... the hotel would be no taller than 60 or 70 feet tall..."
85	Grade Sep Alternative - Aesthetics
86	74 lbs/day with mitigation...
87	Impact AIR-2 + construction emissions
88	<p>6-46 [Table 6-3]:</p> <p>Parking:  Ballpark: 2,000  Hotel: 200  Residential: 3,000  Commercial: 3,900</p> <p>[total=9,100]</p>
89	Table 6-4, 4.7 GHG Emissions, Impact GHG-1, columns "alt 3" and "alt 4"
90	Comparative Analysis
91	Description of the No Project Alternative.
92	53,113 MTCO2e as opposed to 2,956

	D
	Change 6 to "21 and 25"
83	These results were recently updated due to a model error. revised here
84	incorrect, could be as tall as the max heights indicated on the blocks, remove reference
85	reference to max 400 towers to be updated to 600. Also please update analysis to include shadow impacts
86	change to 81 lb/day
87	Discuss
88	<p>Project Description says:</p> <p>Ballpark: 2,000  Hotel: 200  Residential: 3,000  Office: 3,000  Retail: 700</p> <p>[total = 8,900]</p>
	alt 3: Could change to "More emissions from construction" (consistent with AQ)
89	alt 4: Could change to "Less emissions" (consistent with AQ)
90	the tables should be moved up above 6.4 Alternatives considered but rejected, to be right under 6.3 comparative.
91	Not clear why this text is comparing the off-site alternative to the "No Project Alternative"
92	<p>Updated from "53113 as opposed to 52956" to</p> <p>"53124 MT CO2e as opposed to 53026 MT CO2e"</p>

	E
83	Ramboll
84	NR
85	GD
86	Ramboll
87	Ramboll
88	
89	Ramboll
90	GD
91	RMM
92	Ramboll

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1	<b>checklist</b>							
2	<b>Consultant</b>	<b>Received?</b>						
3	HLB/Darcie	Yes						
4	SCJ/Perry	Yes						
5	BIG							
6	Art							
7	Paul Hastings	Yes						
8	F+P	Yes						
9	Engeo	Yes						
10	Dean Tibbs	Yes						
11	Meyers+	Yes						
12	WJE	Yes						
13	Vistra							
14	Ramboll	Yes						
15								
16								
17								
18								
19	<b>Consultant</b>	<b>3.0 PD</b>	<b>4.10 LU</b>	<b>4.15 Transportation</b>	<b>5.0 Gondola</b>	<b>5.0 Vistra</b>	<b>6.0 Alternatives</b>	<b>7.0 Impact Overview</b>
20	Gibson Dunn	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
21	RMM	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
22	BIG		X					
23	HLB		X					
24	Art				X	X		
25	SCJ				X			
26	Paul Hastings				X	X		
27	F+P				X			
28	Engeo				X			
29	Dean Tibbs					X		
30	Meyers +					X		
31	WJE					X		
32	Vistra					X		
33	Ramboll					X		